

SUSANA MARTINEZ Governor

JOHN A. SANCHEZ Lieutenant Governor

NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Harold Runnels Building, N2050 1190 South St. Francis Drive (87505) P.O. Box 5469, Santa Fe, NM 87502-5469 Phone (505) 827-0187 Fax (505) 827-0160 www.nmenv.state.nm.us



RYAN FLYNN Cabinet Secretary

BUTCH TONGATE Deputy Secretary

Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested

June 11, 2014

Ms. Sue Padilla Utilities Director City of Salem 845 N. Motel Blvd. Las Cruces, New Mexico 88007

Re: Minor Municipal; SIC 4952; NPDES Compliance Evaluation; Salem Wastewater Treatment Plant; NM0030457; May 14, 2014

Dear Ms. Padilla:

Enclosed, please find a copy of the report and check list for the referenced inspection that the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) conducted at your facility on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). This inspection report will be sent to the USEPA in Dallas for their review. These inspections are used by USEPA to determine compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program in accordance with requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act.

You are encouraged to review the inspection report, required to correct any problems noted during the inspection, and advised to modify your operational and/or administrative procedures, as appropriate. If you have comments on or concerns with the basis for the findings in the NMED inspection report, please contact us (see the address below) in writing within 30 days from the date of this letter. Further, you are encouraged to notify in writing both the USEPA and NMED regarding modifications and compliance schedules at the addresses below:

Racquel Douglas US Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI Enforcement Branch (6EN-WM) 1445 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas 75202-2733 Bruce Yurdin
New Mexico Environment Department
Surface Water Quality Bureau
Point Source Regulation Section
P.O. Box 5469
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502

Salem WWTP June 11, 2014 Page 2

If you have any questions about this inspection report, please contact Daniel Valenta at 505-827-2575 or at daniel.valenta@state.nm.us.

Sincerely,

/s/Bruce Yurdin

Bruce J. Yurdin Program Manager Point Source Regulation Section Surface Water Quality Bureau

cc: Rashida Bowlin, USEPA (6EN-AS) by e-mail
Carol Peters, USEPA (6EN-WM) by e-mai
Brent Larsen, USEPA (6WQ) by e-mail
Racquel Douglas, USEPA (6EN-WM) by e-mail
Gladys Gooden-Jackson, USEPA (6EN-WC) by e-mail
NMED District III, Mike Kesler by e-mail



Form Approved OMB No. 2040-0003

•	SEPA																	Ap	prova	al Exp	ires 7-	31-85
				NPDI	ES Co	mpli	iance	e Insp	ectio	on R	epor	t										
								onal Da														
1	Transaction Code N	. 1.	1 1	NPDES	5	7	111		ı	1 4		r/mo/d	Ľ	۱,	17	In 18	spec. T	Гуре	Iı 19	inspect	tor	Fac Type
1	N 2 5 3 N M 0	0	3	0 4	5	7	J	12	1	4	U	5	1	4	17	18	C	_	19	S	20	1
	M I N O R	v v	w T	P				Remar	KS													
	Inspection Work Days 67 69		Facility E	Evaluation 1	Rating		71	BI N	72	QA N	73	_	 	74	75		-Reser	rved				80
				-		Se	ection	B: Fac	cility l	Data												
POT	ne and Location of Facility Inspected (W name and NPDES permit number) em Wastewater Treatment Plant	For in	dustrial us	sers discho	irging t	o POT	ΓW, al	lso incli	ude		ry Tin 14/M a							rmit Ef bruary			e	
Gra	m I-25, exit Garfield/Salem Exit, to nd Ave/Roming Dr. before crossin ee, WWTP can be see beside the le	g the									t Time 1 0/Ma							rmit Ex inuary			ate	
	ne(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title			na Ana Co												Ot	har Fa	cility D)oto			
	_	(8)/111	one and 1	ax Ivuilloc	1(8)																	
	n Prieto/Operator/575-640-7620 rt Moffatt, Operations Manager, 5	75-63	5-5634, f	ax 575-23°	3-2195	5												° 41' 37				
Nan	ne, Address of Responsible Official/Ti	tle/Pho	one and Fa	ax Number												LO	ONG 1	10 7 ° 12	2' 32.	.73" V	V	
	Padilla/845 N. Motel Blvd., Las C 7142 fax 575-525-6199	ruces	, New Me	exico 8800	0 7 / Uti	lities	Direc	ctor/57	5-	Yes	Γ		tacted No	X]	SI	C 495	2				
											-				•							
			(S	S = Satisfac				Evaluat l, U = U					Evalua	ated)								
S	Permit	S	Flow M	Ieasureme	nt			S	Ope	eratio	ns & I	Maint	enanc	e		N	CSC)/SSO				
M	Records/Reports	S	Self-Mo	onitoring l	Prograi	m		S	Slu	ıdge I	Iandli	ng/Di	sposa	l		N	Poll	ution I	Preve	ention		
S	Facility Site Review	N	Compli	iance Sche	dules			N	Pro	etreat	ment					N	Mul	ltimedi	ia			
S	Effluent/Receiving Waters	S	Labora	atory				N	Sto	rm V	Vater					N	Oth	er:				
Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments (Attach additional sheets if necessary)																						
1.	SEE REPORT AND FURTHER	EXP	LANATI	ONS.																		
Nan	ne(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector	(s)			Age	ency/C	Office/	/Teleph	one/I	ax							Dat	te				
DA	ANIEL VALENTA /s/Danie	l Vale	enta			Agency/Office/Telephone/Fax NMED/SWQB 505-827-2575						6/11/2014										
					2 12/1		QD	202 02		-									,, 11/.	2017		
Sign	nature of Management QA Reviewer							Phone			lumbe	ers					Da					
/ /0				NM	ED/S	WQB	505-82	27-279	98							6/11/2014						

/s/Sarah Holcomb

SARAH HOLCOMB

Salem Wastewater Treatment Facility	PERMIT NO. NM0030457
SECTION A - PERMIT VERIFICATION	
PERMIT SATISFACTORILY ADDRESSES OBSERVATIONS \(\text{\subset} \ S \ \supset M \ \supset U \ \supset NA (further educations) \) DETAILS:	EXPLANATION ATTACHED No.)
1. CORRECT NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF PERMITTEE	⊠ y □ n □ na
2. NOTIFICATION GIVEN TO EPA/STATE OF NEW DIFFERENT OR INCREASED DISCHARGES	□Y □ N ⊠ NA
3. NUMBER AND LOCATION OF DISCHARGE POINTS AS DESCRIBED IN PERMIT	⊠ y □ n □ na
4. ALL DISCHARGES ARE PERMITTED	⊠y □ n □ na
SECTION B - RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING EVALUATION	
RECORDS AND REPORTS MAINTAINED AS REQUIRED BY PERMIT. DETAILS: S M U NA (FURTHER.)	EXPLANATION ATTACHED <u>Yes</u>)
1. ANALYTICAL RESULTS CONSISTENT WITH DATA REPORTED ON DMRs.	⊠y □ N □ NA
2. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES DATA ADEQUATE AND INCLUDE.	⊠s □ m □u □ na
a) DATES, TIME(S) AND LOCATION(S) OF SAMPLING	⊠ y □ n □ na
b) NAME OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMING SAMPLING	⊠y □ n □ na
c) ANALYTICAL METHODS AND TECHNIQUES.	⊠ y □ n □ na
d) RESULTS OF ANALYSES AND CALIBRATIONS.	⊠y□ N □ NA
e) DATES AND TIMES OF ANALYSES.	⊠y □ n □ na
f) NAME OF PERSON(S) PERFORMING ANALYSES.	⊠ Y □ N □ NA
3. LABORATORY EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION AND MAINTENANCE RECORDS ADEQUATE.	⊠s □ m □u □ NA
4. PLANT RECORDS INCLUDE SCHEDULES, DATES OF EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.	⊠S □ M □ U □ NA
5. EFFLUENT LOADINGS CALCULATED USING DAILY EFFLUENT FLOW AND DAILY ANALYTICAL DATA.	□ y ⊠ n □ na
SECTION C – OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	
TREATMENT FACILITY PROPERLY OPERATED AND MAINTAINED. Maintained. S M U NA (FURTHER IN DETAILS:	EXPLANATION ATTACHED No_)
1. TREATMENT UNITS PROPERLY OPERATED.	⊠s □ m □ u □ NA
2. TREATMENT UNITS PROPERLY MAINTAINED.	⊠s □m □u □ na
3. STANDBY POWER OR OTHER EQUIVALENT PROVIDED. No backup power on site, portable generators ar	⊠S □ M □ U □N e available if needed
4. ADEQUATE ALARM SYSTEM FOR POWER OR EQUIPMENT FAILURES AVAILABLE.	⊠ s □ m □ u □ NA
5. ALL NEEDED TREATMENT UNITS IN SERVICE.	⊠ S □ M □ U □ NA
6. ADEQUATE NUMBER OF QUALIFIED OPERATORS PROVIDED.	⊠s □ m □ u □ na
7. SPARE PARTS AND SUPPLIES INVENTORY MAINTAINED. Some spare parts on site but most at Central wareh	⊠S □M□U□NA
8. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE MANUAL AVAILABLE. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES AND SCHEDULES ESTABLISHED. PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY TREATMENT CONTROL ESTABLISHED.	⊠y□n □na ⊠y□ n □ na ⊠y □ n □ na

Salem Wastewater Treatment Facility	PERMIT NO. NM0030457			
SECTION C - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE (CONT'D)				
9. HAVE BYPASSES/OVERFLOWS OCCURRED AT THE PLANT OR IN THE COLLECTION SYSTEM IN THE LAST YEAR? IF SO, HAS THE REGULATORY AGENCY BEEN NOTIFIED? HAS CORRECTIVE ACTION BEEN TAKEN TO PREVENT ADDITIONAL BYPASSES/OVERFLOWS?	□ y ⊠ n □ na □ y □ n ⊠ na □ y □ n ⊠ na			
10. HAVE ANY HYDRAULIC OVERLOADS OCCURRED AT THE TREATMENT PLANT? IF SO, DID PERMIT VIOLATIONS OCCUR AS A RESULT?	□ y ⊠ n □ na □ y ⊠ n □ na			
SECTION D - SELF-MONITORING				
PERMITTEE SELF-MONITORING MEETS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. □ S□ M□ U□ NA (FURTHER EX.) □ DETAILS:	PLANATION ATTACHED <u>No</u>).			
1. SAMPLES TAKEN AT SITE(S) SPECIFIED IN PERMIT.	ĭ y □n □ na			
2. LOCATIONS ADEQUATE FOR REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES.	⊠ y □ n □ na			
3. FLOW PROPORTIONED SAMPLES OBTAINED WHEN REQUIRED BY PERMIT.	□ y □ n ⊠ na			
4. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES COMPLETED ON PARAMETERS SPECIFIED IN PERMIT.	⊠ y □ N □ NA			
5. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES PERFORMED AT FREQUENCY SPECIFIED IN PERMIT.	⊠y □ N □ NA			
6. SAMPLE COLLECTION PROCEDURES ADEQUATE	⊠ y □ n □ na			
a) SAMPLES REFRIGERATED DURING COMPOSITING.	⊠ y □ n □ NA			
b) PROPER PRESERVATION TECHNIQUES USED.	⊠y □ N □ NA			
c) CONTAINERS AND SAMPLE HOLDING TIMES CONFORM TO 40 CFR 136.3.	⊠y □ N □ NA			
7. IF MONITORING AND ANALYSES ARE PERFORMED MORE OFTEN THAN REQUIRED BY PERMIT, ARE THE RESULTS REPORTED IN PERMITTEE'S SELF-MONITORING REPORT?	⊠y □n □na			
SECTION E - FLOW MEASUREMENT				
PERMITTEE FLOW MEASUREMENT MEETS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. □ M □ U □ NA (FURTHER EXPL DETAILS:	ANATION ATTACHED No)			
PRIMARY FLOW MEASUREMENT DEVICE PROPERLY INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED. TYPE OF DEVICE 4" Parshall Flume & ISCO Ultrasonic flow meter	⊠y □ N □ NA			
2. FLOW MEASURED AT EACH OUTFALL AS REQUIRED.	⊠y □ N □ NA			
3. SECONDARY INSTRUMENTS (TOTALIZERS, RECORDERS, ETC.) PROPERLY OPERATED AND MAINTAINED	⊠ y □ n □ na			
4. CALIBRATION FREQUENCY ADEQUATE. (DATE OF LAST CALIBRATION Quarterly) RECORDS MAINTAINED OF CALIBRATION PROCEDURES. CALIBRATION CHECKS DONE TO ASSURE CONTINUED COMPLIANCE.	⊠y□ n□ na ⊠ y □ n □ na ⊠ y □ n □ na			
5. FLOW ENTERING DEVICE WELL DISTRIBUTED ACROSS THE CHANNEL AND FREE OF TURBULENCE. During high discharge rates standing waves are present.	□ y ⊠ n □na			
6. HEAD MEASURED AT PROPER LOCATION.	⊠ y □ n □ na			
7. FLOW MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT ADEQUATE TO HANDLE EXPECTED RANGE OF FLOW RATES.	⊠y □ n □ na			
SECTION F – LABORATORY				
PERMITTEE LABORATORY PROCEDURES MEET PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. S M U U NA (FURTHER EXPL.) DETAILS:	ANATION ATTACHED <u>No</u>)			
1. EPA APPROVED ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES USED (40 CFR 136.3 FOR LIQUIDS, 503.8(b) FOR SLUDGES)	⊠y □ n □ na			

Salem Wastewater Treatment Facility							PERMIT NO. NM0030457		
SECTION F - LAI	SECTION F - LABORATORY (CONT'D)								
2. IF ALTERNATIVE	2. IF ALTERNATIVE ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES ARE USED, PROPER APPROVAL HAS BEEN OBTAINED								
3. SATISFACTORY O	3. SATISFACTORY CALIBRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF INSTRUMENTS AND EQUIPMENT. Only pH reading taken on site.								
4. QUALITY CONTR	4. QUALITY CONTROL PROCEDURES ADEQUATE.								
5. DUPLICATE SAM	PLES ARE ANALYZED	10% OF THE TIM	ſE.			$\boxtimes_Y \square_N$	× NA		
6. SPIKED SAMPLES	6. SPIKED SAMPLES ARE ANALYZED% OF THE TIME.								
7. COMMERCIAL LA	ABORATORY USED.					□y⊠n	□ NA		
LAB NAME	Dona An	n County Utilities							
LAB ADDRESS	845 N. M	otel Blvd, Las Cruces	s, NM						
PARAMETERS PEI	RFORMED TSS, BO	DD, e-Coli							
granton a ru		va wy mena onar	NY A MY ONY G						
OUTFALL NO.	FLUENT/RECEIVIN OIL SHEEN	G WATERS OBSER	TURBIDITY	VISIBLE FOAM	NA (FURTHER EXPLANATE FLOAT SOL.	COLOR	OTHER		
001	NO	NO NO	Clear	NO	NO	NO	No Smell		
RECEIVING WATER	R OBSERVATIONS:								
SECTION H - SLUDGE DISPOSAL									
SLUDGE DISPOSAL MEETS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. \boxtimes S \square M \square U \square NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED No.). DETAILS: Sludge taken to Las Cruces landfill.									
1. SLUDGE MANAGEMENT ADEQUATE TO MAINTAIN EFFLUENT QUALITY. SS □ M □ U □ NA									
2. SLUDGE RECOR	DS MAINTAINED AS R	EQUIRED BY 40 CFR 5	03.			⊠ s □ m □ u [S D M D U D NA		
3. FOR LAND APPL	IED SLUDGE, TYPE OF	F LAND APPLIED TO: _	(e.g., FOR	REST, AGRICULTURAL,	PUBLIC CONTACT SITE	Ξ)			
SECTION I - SAMPLING INSPECTION PROCEDURES (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED <u>no</u>).									
1. SAMPLES OBTAINED THIS INSPECTION.									
2. TYPE OF SAMPL	E OBTAINED								
GRAB COMPOSITE SAMPLE METHOD FREQUENCY									
3. SAMPLES PRESERVED. □ Y □ N ☒ NA									
4. FLOW PROPORTIONED SAMPLES OBTAINED. □ Y □ N ☒ NA									
5. SAMPLE OBTAINED FROM FACILITY'S SAMPLING DEVICE.							× NA		
6. SAMPLE REPRES	6. SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVE OF VOLUME AND MATURE OF DISCHARGE.								
7. SAMPLE SPLIT V	VITH PERMITTEE.					□y□n∣	× NA		
8. CHAIN-OF-CUST	ODY PROCEDURES EM	MPLOYED.				\square Y \square N	× NA		
9. SAMPLES COLLECTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PERMIT.							× NA		

Introduction

On May 14, 2014 a Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI) was conducted at the Salem Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) located near Salem, New Mexico by Mr. Daniel Valenta of the State of New Mexico Environment Department (NMED). This facility is classified as a minor municipal discharger under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program and is assigned permit number NM0030457. The facility has a design capacity of 0.20 million gallons per day (MGD).

The Salem WWTP discharges into Rio Grande in Segment 20.6.4.101 NMAC of the Lower Rio Grande River Basin NMAC (*State of New Mexico Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Water*). Segment 20.6.4.101 has an USEPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) established for E-coli bacteria. Designated uses of this segment are irrigation, marginal aquatic life, livestock watering, wildlife habitat, and secondary contact.

The NMED performs a certain number of CEI's for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) each year. The purpose of this inspection is to provide USEPA with information to evaluate the permittee's compliance with the NPDES permit. This report is based on review of files maintained by the permittee and NMED, on-site observation by NMED personnel, and verbal information provided by the permittee's representative. Findings of the inspection are detailed on the attached EPA form 3560-3 and in the narrative Further Explanations section of the report.

The inspector arrived at the Salem WWTP at 0914 hours on May 14, 2014. The Operations Manager, Mr. Kurt Moffatt, was contacted by phone but was not available on the day of the inspection. Operator Josh Prieto was contacted, he was able to meet the Inspector at the plant. No documents are kept at the facility for review. Lab bench sheets, chain of custody, and calibration documents were requested and supplied from the Water Utilities Department in Las Cruces for the months of January, February, and March of 2014.

Treatment Plant Decription

Raw sewage from approximately 250 homes is collected in a newly rebuilt lift station located northeast of the plant and pumped to the entrance works. In an emergency situation such as power failure, influent can be pumped directly to the SRB basins with the aid of portable generators and pumps.

The facility consists of two Sequencing Batch Reactors (SBR's) designed to treat an average of 200,000 gpd wastewater collected from the Communities of Salem and Ogaz. At the entrance works, raw sewage passes through a manual bar screen, manual grit chamber, and Parshall flume. Depending on the SBR cycling times, influent then enters either of the two Aqua Aerobics reactors. Both reactors are equipped with a bank of air diffusers on the west side and a mixer on the east side. During the fill cycle for one reactor, the other reactor is either in a treatment cycle or decant mode.

The facility utilizes the following phase times within the SBR basins: anoxic fill with mixing 30 minutes; aerated fill 150 minutes; aeration 30 minutes; settling 120 minutes; and sludge wasting, decant and idle 30 minutes. These periods are adjusted over time to enhance plant efficiency. Four, six-hour cycles are run in each SBR basin per day. The decanted flow passes to the equalization basin, which has been partially covered to prevent algal build-up and then flows to the Infilco Degremont, Inc. UV disinfection unit. This unit contains 20 lamps. Effluent flow is measured by a 4" Parshall flume in conjunction with an ISCO Model 4210 ultrasonic flow meter with a totalizer. The effluent is then discharged to the Rio Grande. Sludge is wasted four times a day at a rate of 99 gallons per minute. SBR #1 wastes for 0.5 minutes per cycle and SBR #2 wastes for 0.6 minutes per cycle. Waste activated sludge is pumped to the Aqua Aerobics aerobic digester for dewatering and thickening. The thickened sludge is pumped to one of four concrete paved sludge drying beds as necessary (usually once per month). Supernatant from sludge bed bottoms drain back to the reactors. Solids removed from the drying beds are shipped to Las Cruces landfill for final disposal.

Plant operators visit the facility everyday, for at least three to four hours, including weekends. The staff performs general maintenance and checks around the facility. During the remaining hours, the facility is monitored on an "on-call" basis. The facility operates 24 hours a day, regularly alternating each batch reactor on predetermined schedule. If a problem occurs at the WWTP the facility has a system in place to notify the operators. The lift station is located in town next to a major road, should a problem occur a flashing red emergency light is activated.

Further Explanations

Section B-Recordkeeping & Reporting Evaluation-Overall Rating of "Marginal"

1. Permit Requirements – for Recordkeeping and Reporting Evaluation

Part I.A. of the permit has a 30 Day Average (mg/l), 7 Day Average (mg/l), and a 30-Day Average loading (lbs/day) requirement for BOD and TSS.

Total mass (lbs/day) = (flow (MGD)) x (8.34) x (concentration (mg/l))

A review of analytical results for January, February, and March of 2014 was conducted after the inspection using records maintained by the permittee for outfall 001. No permit limits were exceeded during the reviewed time period.

Reporting Period: From January 1, 2014 to March 30, 2014

BOD5 30-Day Average mg/l

```
January = 2.60 \text{ mg/l} + 3.32 \text{ mg/l} = 5.92/2 = 2.96 \text{ mg/l} \text{ vs} (reported on DMR) 2.96 \text{ mg/l} February = 4.56 \text{ mg/l} + 5.81 \text{ mg/l} = 10.37/2 = 5.18 \text{ mg/l} \text{ vs} (reported on DMR) 5.19 \text{ mg/l} March = 1.80 \text{ mg/l} + 3.85 \text{ mg/l} = 5.65/2 = 2.82 \text{ mg/l} vs (reported on DMR) 2.83 \text{ mg/l}
```

BOD5 30 Day Average lbs/day

```
January 8 – (0.046 MGD) (2.60 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 0.997 lbs/day
January 22– (0.035 MGD) (3.32 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 0.969 lbs/day
0.997 lbs/day + 0.969 lbs/day = 1.97/2 = 0.985 lbs/day vs (reported on DMR) 0.67 lbs/day
February 5– (0.031 MGD) (5.81 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 1.50 lbs/day
```

February 19–(0.040 MGD) (4.56 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 1.52 lbs/day1.50 lbs/day + 1.52 lbs/day = 3.02/2 = 1.51 lbs/day vs (reported on DMR) 1.39 lbs/day

```
March 5– (0.039 \text{ MGD}) (1.80 \text{ mg/l}) (8.34 \text{ lbs/gal}) = 0.58 \text{ lbs/day} March 19–(0.047 \text{ MGD}) (3.85 \text{ mg/l}) (8.34 \text{ lbs/gal}) = 1.51 \text{ lbs/day}
```

0.58 lbs/day + 1.51 lbs/day = 2.09/2 = 1.04 lbs/day vs (reported on DMR) 0.80 lbs/day

TSS 30-Day Average mg/l

January = $7.14 \text{ mg/l} + 4.00 \text{ mg/l} = 11.14/2 = 5.57 \text{ mg/l} \frac{\text{vs}}{\text{(reported on DMR)}} 5.57 \text{ mg/l}$ February = $3.75 \text{ mg/l} + 2.50 \text{ mg/l} = 6.25/2 = 3.12 \text{ mg/l} \frac{\text{vs}}{\text{(reported on DMR)}} 3.13 \text{ mg/l}$ March = 10.00 mg/l + 2.66 mg/l = 12.66/2 = 6.33 mg/l vs (reported on DMR) 6.33 mg/l

TSS 30-Day Average lbs/day

January 8 - (0.046 MGD) (7.14 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 2.74 lbs/day January 22- (0.035 MGD) (4.00 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 1.17 lbs/day

2.74 lbs/day + 1.17 lbs/day = 3.91/2 = 1.95 lbs/day vs (reported on DMR) 1.25 lbs/day

February 5– (0.031 MGD) (3.75 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 0.99 lbs/dayFebruary 19–(0.040 MGD) (2.50 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 0.84 lbs/day

0.99 lbs/day + 0.84 lbs/day = 1.83/2 = 0.91 lbs/day (reported on DMR) 0.84 lbs/day

March 5– (0.039 MGD) (10.00 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 3.25 lbs/dayMarch 19–(0.047 MGD) (2.66 mg/l) (8.34 lbs/gal) = 1.04 lbs/day

3.25 lbs/day + 1.04 lbs/day = 4.29/2 = 2.14 lbs/day vs (reported on DMR) 1.79 lbs/day

E-coli							
	30 Day Average	Daily Max					
	cfu/ml	cfu/ml					
Reported January							
Values	1.0	1.0					
Calculated Values							
	1.0	1.0					
Reported February							
Values	1.0	1.0					
Calculated Values							
	1.0	1.0					
Reported March							
Value	1.41	2.0					
Calculated							
Value	1.41	2.0					

E-coli values have been reported correctly for the months reviewed.

Per the EPA NPDES Reporting Requirements Handbook, Revised August 25, 2004: Reporting of Loading:

"Some parameters in the permit are limited in terms of pounds per day (lbs/day). Although all of these parameters are measured initially in milligrams per liter (mg/L), conversion to lbs/day can be achieved by using the following formula. Always be sure to use the flow measurement determined on the day when sampling was done.

Flow on day of sampling (MGD) x concentration (mg/L) x 8.34 (lbs/gal) = Loading (lbs/day)"

Per Part III.F.6, of the Permit Daily Discharge is defined:

"Means the discharge of a pollutant measured during a calendar day or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents the calendar day for purposes of sampling. For pollutants with limitations expressed in terms of mass, the "daily discharge" is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the sampling day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the "daily discharge" is calculated as the average measurement of the pollutant over the sampling day. "Daily discharge" determination of concentration made using a composite sample shall be the concentration of the composite sample. When grab samples are used, the "daily discharge" determination of concentration shall be arithmetic average (weighted by flow value) of all samples collected during that sampling day."

Finding:

Reviewing documents from January, February, and March 2014 the reported discharge from the facility in lbs. /day was different from the sum calculated from the requested documents. This difference was small but recurring, it was found in the July 14, 2010 and July 11, 2012 inspections. The difference between the DMR reported value and the calculated one is due to using the monthly discharge and not the daily discharge on the day of sampling, see above. Speaking with Mr. Moffatt about this he felt using the monthly average is more representative of the real discharge than using the value on the day of sampling.

The difference in using one value over another is small and would not exceed the permit limits. No exceedences were found in the records reviewed, July 11, 2012 to June 14, 2014. The facility was found to be well operated and maintained. All other records and lab procedures reviewed followed recommended protocols.

Photo # 1

Photographer: Daniel Valenta	Date: 5/14/2014	Time: 0956 hours			
City/County: West of Salem, NM/Dona Ana County					

Location: 2800 B.B. Roming Drive, Dona Ana County, New Mexico

Subject: Bar screen at the headworks of the facility. When lift station fills, effluent is pumped to the

headworks.



Photographer: Daniel Valenta	Date: 5/14/2014	Time: 0953 hours				
City/County: West of Salem, NM/Dona Ana County						
Location: 2800 B.B. Roming Drive, Dona Ana County, New Mexico						
Subject: One of two Sequencing Batch Reactors (SRB).						



Photographer: Daniel Valenta	Date: 5/14/2014	Time: 1006 hours				
City/County: West of Salem, NM/Dona Ana County						
Location: 2800 B.B. Roming Drive, Dona Ana County, New Mexico						
Subject: UV disinfection system, all banks and bulbs working.						



Photographer: Daniel Valenta	Date: 5/14/2014	Time: 1009 hours				
City/County: West of Salem, NM/Dona Ana County						
Location: 2800 B.B. Roming Drive, Dona Ana County, New Mexico						
Subject: 4" Parshall flume and a ISCO Ultrasonic flow meter measure discharge effluent.						



Photographer: Daniel Valenta	Date: 5/14/2014	Time: 1101 hours				
City/County: West of Salem, NM/Dona Ana County						
Location: 2800 B.B. Roming Drive, Dona Ana County, New Mexico						
Subject: Discharge to dry Rio Grande.						

